arXiv:quant-ph/0302128v1 18 Feb 2003

The high energy limit of the trajectory representation of quantum mechanics

Edward R. Floyd
10 Jamaica Village Road, Coronado, CA 92118-3208, USA
floyd@mailaps.org

Abstract

The trajectory representation in the high energy limit (Bohr correspondence principle) manifests a residual indeterminacy. This indeterminacy is compared to the indeterminacy found in the classical limit ($\hbar \to 0$) [Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A 15**, 1363 (2000)] for particles in the classically allowed region, the classically forbidden region, and near the WKB turning point. The differences between Bohr's and Planck's principles for the trajectory representation are compared with the differences between these correspondence principles for the wave representation. The trajectory representation in the high energy limit is shown to go to neither classical nor statistical mechanics. The residual indeterminacy is contrasted to Heisenberg uncertainty. The relationship between indeterminacy and 't Hooft's information loss and equivalence classes is investigated.

PACS Numbers: 3.65.Bz; 3.65.Ca
Key words: high energy limit, trajectory interpretation, Bohr's correspondence principle, residual indeterminacy, 't Hooft's equivalence classes, Heisenberg uncertainty principle.

1 INTRODUCTION

Liboff has studied the Bohr correspondence principle (the high energy limit) of the Schrödinger representation of quantum mechanics.[1] Liboff found that the Bohr correspondence principle and the Planck correspondence principle ($\hbar \to 0$) are not equivalent. Liboff, who worked in the Schrödinger representation, used frequency (spectral) correspondence and form correspondence (the probability density) to investigate the Bohr correspondence. He found that neither the frequency nor the form correspondences apply to all systems. While we shall not investigate the Schrödinger representation here, I do make one comment on one of Liboff's counterexamples. Liboff studied the particle confined in a cubical box with impenetrable walls.[1] Impenetrable walls imply infinitely jumps (discontinuities) in the potential. The particle in this box does not permit a short wave limit because it always has an infinitely large relative change of wavelength at the impenetrable wall.[2] Such a system violates Bohr correspondence by design.

Recently, Planck correspondence ($\hbar \to 0$) has been studied for the trajectory representation.[3] Herein we investigate Bohr correspondence for the trajectory representation of quantum mechanics. Bohr correspondence purports that nonrelativistic quantum mechanics reduces to nonrelativistic classical mechanics in the high energy (often called large n) limit. Of course, this is an idealization that ignores the applicability of relativity in the high energy limit. Following the precedent of Bohr[4,5] and Liboff[1], we also prosecute our investigation couched in the nonrelativistic trajectory representation assuming that the character of the limit is apparent before relativistic corrections are needed. The present state of development of a relatistic trajectory representation is modest.[6,7]

Recently, Faraggi and Matone have shown that, while quantum mechanics is compliant with the equivalence principle where all quantum systems can be connected by an equivalence coordinate transformation

(trivializing map) given by $x \to \tilde{x}(x)$, classical mechanics is not.[8–10] Note that this coordinate transformation is much more stringent than contact and canonical transformations. Faraggi and Matone through the equivalence principle have independently derived, free from axioms, the quantum Hamilton-Jacobi foundation for the trajectory representation of quantum mechanics. This frees the trajectory representation from all Copenhagen philosophy that has been imposed upon the Schrödinger representation of quantum mechanics. We theoretically test Bohr's correspondence principle[4,5] by investigating the transition from quantum to classical mechanics for the trajectory representation, embedded in a non-relativistic quantum Hamilton-Jacobi theory, for the energy growing without bound.

We examine the high energy limit for three cases: a particle in the classically allowed region; a particle in the classically forbidden region (beyond the WKB turning point); and a particle in the vicinity of the WKB turning point. We choose potentials that are heuristic and whose trajectory representation can be presented in closed form by familiar functions. One dimension suffices for this investigation.

The quantum stationary Hamilton-Jacobi equation (QSHJE) is a phenomenological equation just like the classical stationary Hamilton-Jacobi equation (CSHJE) and the Schrödinger equation. The QSHJE and CSHJE render generators of the motion that, for the same potential, describe trajectories that differ. As we shall show herein, these trajectories still generally differ in the high energy limit. The QSHJE in one dimension, x, is given for non-relativistic quantum motion by[8,11,12]

$$\frac{W_x^2}{2m} + V - E = -\frac{\hbar^2}{4m}\langle W; x\rangle \tag{1}$$

where W is the reduced action (also known as Hamilton's characteristic function), W_x is the conjugate momentum, V is the potential, $\hbar = h/(2\pi)$, h is the Planck constant, m is the mass, and $\langle W; x\rangle$ is the Schwarzian derivative that manifests the quantum effects. The Schwarzian derivative contains higher-order derivative terms given by

$$\langle W; x\rangle = \frac{W_{xxx}}{W_x} - \frac{3}{2}\left(\frac{W_{xx}}{W_x}\right)^2.$$

The complete solutions for the reduced action and conjugate momentum are well known and given for energy E by[12,13]

$$W = \hbar \arctan\left(\frac{b\theta/\phi + c/2}{(ab - c^2/4)^{1/2}}\right) + K, \qquad x > 0. \tag{2}$$

and

$$W_x = (2m)^{1/2}(a\phi^2 + b\theta^2 + c\phi\theta)^{-1} \tag{3}$$

where K is an integration constant that we may arbitrarily set $K = 0$ for the rest of this investigation and where (ϕ, θ) is the set of independent solutions to the associated stationary Schrödinger equation for energy E. The Wronskian $\mathcal{W}(\phi, \theta)$ is normalized so that $\mathcal{W}^2 = 2m/[\hbar^2(ab - c^2/4)]$. The set of coefficients (a, b, c) for energy E determines the particular solution for W and W_x. The set (a, b, c) is determined by a sufficient set of a combination of initial values or constants of the motion other than E for the third-order QSHJE. This requires three independent values. For example, the set of coefficients (a, b, c) can be specified by the initial values $[W_x(x_o), W_{xx}(x_o)]$ for the QSHJE plus the Wronskian, $\mathcal{W}$, which is a constant for the Schrödinger equation. The particular solution was shown to specify the particular microstate which had not been detected in the Schrödinger representation.[9,12,14,15] The left side of the QSHJE, Eq. (1), is the CSHJE. If $\hbar$ were zero (as distinguished from the limit $\hbar$ going to zero), then Eq. (1) would trivially reduce to the classical time-independent Hamilton-Jacobi equation. Herein, we test Bohr's correspondence principle by investigating the proposition that quantum mechanics transitions to classical mechanics in the limit that E grows without bound. The trajectory representation of quantum mechanics is well suited for testing Bohr's correspondence principle. While the CSHJE is a first-order nonlinear differential equation, the QSHJE is a

third-order nonlinear differential equation whose second- and third-order terms appear in $\langle W; x\rangle$ as fractions where the numerators and corresponding denominators contain derivative terms of the same degree with regard to exponents. This investigation must include, in the limit $E \to \infty$, the effects of annulling all higher than first order terms in a differential equation upon the particular solution and upon the set of necessary and sufficient initial values.

With the trajectory representation, we show that quantum mechanics in the high energy limit does not generally reduce to classical mechanics. Nor does it reduce to statistical mechanics even though a residual indeterminacy exists in general in the high energy limit. We show that in the classically allowed region Bohr correspondence and Planck correspondence for the trajectory representation are similar; in the neighborhood of the WKB turning point, partly similar; and in the classically forbidden region, not similar. We investigate this residual indeterminacy and contrast it to Heisenberg uncertainty. We also gain insight into the quantum term $\hbar^2\langle W; x\rangle/(4m)$.

Recently, 't Hooft proposed that underlying contemporary quantum mechanics there should exist a more fundamental, albeit still unknown, theory at the Planck level that would provide more information than the Schrödinger wave function.[16] In 't Hooft's proposal, the additional information distinguishes primordial states at the Planck level, but this information is lost through dissipation as these states evolve into states forming an equivalence class. 't Hooft suggested quantum gravity would dissipate information. States of an equivalence class, after a while, become indistinguishable from each other even though they have different pasts. 't Hooft's ideas bear upon this investigation by giving us insight into the relationship of the Copenhagen interpretation to the trajectory representation where information regarding microstates (primordial states) becomes "lost" and where the Schrödinger wave function becomes an equivalence class. We compare residual indeterminacy with 't Hooft's information loss and equivalence classes in the high energy limit. This comparison is preliminary because the underlying fundamental theory of 't Hooft's proposal is not yet complete.

In Section 2, we investigate the Bohr limit of the trajectory representation of quantum mechanics for a particle in the classically allowed region. In Section 3, we examine a trajectory in the Bohr limit in the classical forbidden region. We investigate, in Section 4, a trajectory as it transits between the classically allowed and forbidden regions across the WKB turning point. In Section 5, we discuss the impact of the Bohr limit upon the set of initial values necessary and sufficient to specify the trajectory. In Section 6, we present the relationship between this investigation and 't Hooft's information loss and equivalence classes. In Section 7, we contrast residual indeterminacy to Heisenberg uncertainty.

2 THE CLASSICALLY ALLOWED CASE

Let us examine a particle in the classically allowed region, $E > V(x)$, in the limit that E grows without bound. In the limiting process as E grows without bound, the quantum motion does not approach the classical conjugate motion even though the left hand side of the QSHJE grows without bound while the right side remains finite. Quantum physics is more subtle.

Let us consider a heuristic example. We choose a free particle, $V = 0$. An acceptable set of independent solutions to the Schrödinger equation for the free particle is given by

$$\phi = [E(ab - c^2/4)]^{-1/4} \cos[(2mE)^{1/2}x/\hbar] \quad \text{and} \quad \theta = [E(ab - c^2/4)]^{-1/4} \sin[(2mE)^{1/2}x/\hbar]. \tag{4}$$

The coefficients (a, b, c) specify the particular microstate for a specified energy E in accordance with a sufficient set of a combination of initial values and constants of the motion other than energy.[17]

The reduced action, Eq. (2), may be expressed for $V = 0$ by

$$W = \hbar \arctan\left(\frac{b \tan[(2mE)^{1/2}x/\hbar] + c/2}{(ab - c^2/4)^{1/2}}\right). \tag{5}$$

For $a = b$ and $c = 0$, then $W = (2mE)^{1/2}x$ which coincides with the classical reduced action. For $a \neq b$ or $c \neq 0$, a stratagem is used. We investigate the $\lim_{E\to\infty}(W^{\rm quantum}/W^{\rm classical})$ by using l'Hôpital's rule with regard to E to render

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{E\to\infty}\frac{W^{\rm quantum}}{W^{\rm classical}} &= \lim_{E\to\infty}\frac{\hbar\arctan\left(\frac{b\tan[(2mE)^{1/2}x/\hbar]+c/2}{(ab-c^2/4)^{1/2}}\right)}{(2mE)^{1/2}x}\\ &= \frac{(ab-c^2/4)^{1/2}}{a+b+(a^2-2ab+b^2-c^2)^{1/2}\cos\{[(2mE)^{1/2}x/\hbar]+\cot^{-1}[c/(a-b)]\}}\end{aligned}$$

where we have temporarily used the notation of $W^{\rm quantum}$ for explicitness. As $W^{\rm classical} = (2mE)^{1/2}$ for $E \geq 0$, then we may construct W for energy that is not bound as

$$\lim_{E\to\infty} W = \frac{(ab-c^2/4)^{1/2}(2mE)^{1/2}}{a+b+(a^2-2ab+b^2-c^2)^{1/2}\cos\{[(2mE)^{1/2}x/\hbar]+\cot^{-1}[c/(a-b)]\}}. \tag{6}$$

The quantum reduced action in the limit $E \to \infty$, Eq. (6), manifests the same characteristic residual indeterminacy for either $a \neq b$ or $c \neq 0$ that was also manifested for the reduced action in Planck limit ($\hbar \to 0$).[3] The $E^{1/2}$ factor in the argument of the cosine term in the denominator on the right side of Eq. (6) induces in the high energy limit an essential singularity in the cosine term. This essential singularity in turn induces an indeterminacy in the reduced action, W, in the high energy limit if $a \neq b$ or $c \neq 0$. The magnitude of this indeterminacy is a function of the particular microstate as determined by the set of coefficients (a, b, c). The phase shift of this indeterminacy is a function of $c/(a - b)$. This indefiniteness in $\lim_{E\to\infty} W$ does not exist when E is finite. We shall return latter in this section after we have established the equations of motion to show that this indefiniteness can be removed and that another generator of the motion, Hamilton's principal function, S, for quantum motion in the high energy limit goes to the Hamilton's principal function, $S^{\rm classical}$, of classical mechanics.

We note that for $a = b$ and $c = 0$, then $\lim_{E\to\infty} W = W^{\rm classical}$ as did W for Planck correspondence.[3] The quantum reduced action in the high energy limit mimics the quantum reduced action for Planck correspondence for all microstates (a, b, c) in the quantum allowed region because the wave number in the cosine term in the denominator has the same form, $(2mE)^{1/2}/\hbar$, which manifests the same essential singularity. Whether E grows without bound or $\hbar \to 0$, the wavelength becomes infinitesimally short. Hence both Bohr and Planck correspondences in their respective limits manifest an equivalent indetermination for the quantum reduced action in the classically allowed region. This allows us to extract the results for Planck correspondence[3] in the allowed region for our investigation of Bohr correspondence.

The quantum conjugate momentum for $V = 0$ can be expressed as

$$W_x = \frac{2(2mE)^{1/2}(ab-c^2/4)^{1/2}}{a+b+[(a-b)^2+c^2]^{1/2}\cos\{[2(2mE)^{1/2}x/\hbar]+\cot^{-1}[c/(a-b)]\}}. \tag{7}$$

In the limit $E \to \infty$ the cosine term in the denominator in Eq. (7) fluctuates with an infinitesimally short wavelength. This induces in W_x a residual indeterminacy in the high energy limit. In the trajectory representation, we know the microstates, but in the Schrödinger representation we do not know the microstate because the Schrödinger representation assumes a reduced set of initial values insufficient to specify the microstate. For finite E, W_x is always specified by (E, a, b, c, x) in the trajectory representation, but the Copenhagen interpretation denies knowledge of (a, b, c) while championing Heisenberg uncertainty.

Nevertheless, we can evaluate its average momentum by averaging W_x over one cycle of the cosine term.[3] We shall use this averaging process to gain insight into the quantum term $\hbar^2\langle W; x\rangle/(4m)$. Nothing herein implies that we are considering an ensemble of identical microstates rather than a solitary microstate. The averaging process leads to[3]

$$\left\langle \lim_{E\to\infty} W_x \right\rangle_{\rm ave} = \lim_{E\to\infty} \frac{(2mE)^{1/2}}{\hbar\pi} \int_{\frac{-\hbar\pi}{(8mE)^{1/2}}}^{\frac{\hbar\pi}{(8mE)^{1/2}}} W_x(E,a,b,c,x+x')\,dx'$$

$$= \frac{2(2mE)^{1/2}(ab-c^2/4)^{1/2}}{(a+b)[1-\frac{(a-b)^2-c^2}{(a+b)^2}]^{1/2}} = (2mE)^{1/2}. \tag{8}$$

[We have changed for this step the operational order of evaluating the high energy limit and averaging on the right side of Eq. (8) because the averaging domain is dependent upon E. We continue this practice throughout.] In the high energy limit, the average conjugate momentum is the classical momentum and microstate information as specified by the set of coefficients (a,b,c) is lost.

The average for $\lim_{E\to\infty} W_x^2$ is given as[3]

$$\left\langle \lim_{E\to\infty} W_x^2 \right\rangle_{\rm ave} = \left\langle \left(\lim_{E\to\infty} W_x \right)^2 \right\rangle_{\rm ave} = mE\frac{a+b}{(ab-c^2/4)^{1/2}} \geq 2mE. \tag{9}$$

If we identify $W_x^2/(2m)$ as the effective kinetic energy, then the average of the high energy limit of the effective kinetic energy for $V=0$ is greater than E for $a\neq b$ or $c\neq 0$ and is equal to E for $a=b$ and $c=0$.

Now let us examine the variance of W_x in the high energy limit. By Eqs. (8) and (9), we have[3]

$$\left\langle \lim_{E\to\infty} W_x^2 \right\rangle_{\rm ave} - \left(\left\langle \lim_{E\to\infty} W_x \right\rangle_{\rm ave} \right)^2 = 2mE\frac{a+b-(4ab-c^2)^{1/2}}{(4ab-c^2)^{1/2}} \geq 0. \tag{10}$$

Even in the high energy limit, the variance of the quantum conjugate momentum, W_x, still is a function of the coefficients (a,b,c) that, in turn, manifest microstates. For $a=b$ and $c=0$, then the variance of W_x is zero. In this particular microstate, the quantum motion reduces to classical motion for any value of E because the additional necessary initial values of the QSHJE, $[W_x(x_o), W_{xx}(x_o)]$ are both zero for a given energy E.

The average energy associated with the Schwarzian derivative term of the QSHJE in the high energy limit is given from Eqs. (8–10) by[3]

$$\left\langle \lim_{E\to\infty} \frac{\hbar^2}{4m}\langle W;x\rangle \right\rangle_{\rm ave} = E\left(1-\frac{(a+b)/2}{(ab-c^2/4)^{1/2}}\right) = -\frac{\text{variance of } \lim_{E\to\infty} W_x}{2m} \leq 0. \tag{11}$$

So the average energy, in the high energy limit, of the quantum term, $\hbar^2\langle W;x\rangle/(4m)$, which is also known for unbound states as Bohm's quantum potential, Q, is proportional to the negative of the variance of the high energy limit of the conjugate momentum. The quantum potential is a function of the particular microstate and may be finite even in the high energy limit as shown by Eq. (11). As such, this potential is not a function of spatial position alone but is path dependent and, thus, cannot be a conservative potential.

Let us now consider the equation of motion that is given by Jacobi's theorem, $t-t_o = W_E$. For the free particle with energy E, the motion is given by[3]

$$t-t_o = \frac{(ab-c^2/4)^{1/2}(2m/E)^{1/2}x}{a+b+(a^2-2ab+b^2+c^2)^{1/2}\cos\{2(2mE)^{1/2}x/\hbar+\cot^{-1}[c/(a-b)]\}}. \tag{12}$$

For $a=b$ and $c=0$, Eq. (12) reduces to the classical equation of motion, $t-t_o=(2mE)^{1/2}x$.

Let us now evaluate Hamilton's principal function, $S=W-Et$, in the high energy limit. Since we have solved the equations of motion, we are able to show that S is the time integral of the Lagrangian of classical mechanics, $L^{\rm classical}$. For $V=0$, the classical Lagrangian is a constant give by $L^{\rm classical}=E$. As the right sides of Eqs. (6) and (12) are dynamically similar except for the factor E, the reduced action in the high energy limit may be expressed as a function of time by $\lim_{E\to\infty} W = 2E(t-t_o)$. The high energy limit

of the reduced action is independent of the set of coefficients (a, b, c). Subsequently, Hamilton's principal function may be expressed by[3]

$$\lim_{E\to\infty} S = E(t - t_o) = \int_{t_o}^{t} L^{\text{classical}}\, dt = S^{\text{classical}} \tag{13}$$

independent of microstate, (a, b, c).

Let us now return to the equation of motion. As before with Eq. (7), in the limit $E \to \infty$ the cosine term in the denominator on the right side of Eq. (12) fluctuates with an infinitesimally short wave length. This induces a residual indeterminacy in $t(x)$. Again as before in the classical limit, we can evaluate the average (this time for t rather than for W_x) by averaging the right side of the preceding equation over one cycle of the cosine term in the denominator although here we have x as a factor in the numerator. As in our investigation of Planck correspondence,[3] the x factor in the numerator is fasted to a single value over the infinitesimally short wavelength of the cosine term. This leads to

$$\Big\langle \lim_{E\to\infty} (t - t_o) \Big\rangle_{\text{ave}} = \frac{[(ab - c^2/4)(2m/E)]^{1/2} x}{(a + b)[1 - \frac{(a-b)^2 - c^2}{(a+b)^2}]^{1/2}} = \Big(\frac{m}{2E}\Big)^{1/2} x \tag{14}$$

independent of the coefficients (a, b, c). While individual microstates have a residual indeterminacy in the high energy limit in its motion in the $[x, t]$ domain, this indeterminacy is centered about the classical motion in the $[x, t]$ domain regardless of which particular microstate is specified. Nevertheless, the degree of indeterminacy is a function of the microstate as specified by (a, b, c).

3 CLASSICALLY FORBIDDEN CASE

The QSHJE renders real solutions, including conjugate momentum, for the trajectory even in the classically forbidden region. On the other hand, the CSHJE has a turning point at the WKB turning point. If classical trajectories were permitted beyond the turning point, the classical momentum would become imaginary. Let us now examine a particle in the classically forbidden region, $E < V(x)$. Thus, we have to modify Bohr correspondence in the classical forbidden region to permit E to grow to less than the upper bound of $V(x)$ for x beyond the WKB turning point. (Note that this condition permits tunneling, which is not examined herein but has been examined for sub-barrier energies well below the barrier potential in Ref. 13.) For this investigation, we assume a finite potential well in the classically forbidden regions that $V \gg 1$ but remains finite for finite x. We investigate Bohr correspondence in the classically forbidden region by assuming that the $V - E$ is finite and positive. Here, we choose to examine a square well given by

$$V = \begin{cases} U > E \gg 1, & |x| \geq q \\ 0, & |x| < q. \end{cases}$$

The trajectories for the bound states for this square well have already been studied.[18] For brevity and without any loss of physics, we only examine the symmetric bound states herein. The set of independent solutions (ϕ, θ) for this square well is chosen such that ϕ represents the symmetric bound state given by

$$\phi = \left(\frac{2m}{\hbar^2 k^2 (ab - c^2/4)}\right)^{1/4} \cdot \begin{cases} \cos(kq)\exp[-\kappa(x - q)], & x > q \\ \cos(kx), & -q \leq x \leq q \\ \cos(kq)\exp[\kappa(x + q)] & x < -q \end{cases} \tag{15}$$

where $k = (2mE)^{1/2}/\hbar$ and $\kappa = [2m(U - E)]^{1/2}/\hbar$. The other solution, θ, is unbound and is not unique as any amount of ϕ may be added to it. While ϕ is symmetric for the symmetric bound state, the corresponding θ that we have chosen is antisymmetric. We present this unbound solution as

$$\theta = \left(\frac{2m}{\hbar^2 k^2 (ab - c^2/4)}\right)^{1/4} \cdot \begin{cases} \dfrac{\exp[\kappa(x-q)] - \cos(2kq)\exp[-\kappa(x+q)]}{2\sin(kq)}, & x > q \\ \sin(kx), & -q \le x \le q \\ \dfrac{\cos(2kq)\exp[\kappa(x+q)] - \exp[-\kappa(x+q)]}{2\sin(kq)}, & x < -q. \end{cases} \tag{16}$$

The corresponding Wronskian obeys $\mathcal{W}^2(\phi, \theta) = 2m/[\hbar^2(ab - c^2/4)] > 0$ as expected. For bound states, microstates of the Schrödinger wave function exist where the particular choice of the set of coefficients (a, b, c) specifies the microstate and a unique trajectory in phase space for a given quantized energy E.[17]

The dwell time, $t_{\pm R}$, is the time particle spends in the a classically forbidden region during the round trip transit along its trajectory from the wall of the square well at $x = \pm q$ out to its reflection at the turning point at $x = \pm\infty$ and then its return back to $x = \pm q$. The dwell time, t_R, has been shown to be[18]

$$t_{\pm R} = 2\frac{(ab - c^2/4)^{1/2}[1 + (\kappa/k)^2]}{a \pm c(\kappa/k) + b(\kappa/k)^2}\frac{m}{\hbar\kappa k} \tag{17}$$

where the sign for the coefficient c in the denominator is dependent upon which interface, $x = \pm q$ is applicable. (Lest we forget, c itself may be negative too.) The trajectory for the microstate, (a, b, c), will not be symmetric if $c \neq 0$. The existence of unsymmetric microstates of symmetric Schrödinger wave functions have already been discussed elsewhere.[19] For $a = b$ and $c = 0$, Eq. (17) becomes

$$t_R = t_{+R} = t_{-R} = 2m/(\hbar\kappa k) = \hbar/[E(U - E)]^{1/2}$$

which is consistent with findings of Hartman[20] and Fletcher[21] for tunnelling times, t_T when one takes into account that[22,23] $t_T = t_R$. Note that t_R is inversely proportional to κ or $(U - E)^{1/2}$. This implies that the particle velocity increases as $(U - E)^{1/2}$ increases which is consistent with the findings of Barton.[24] This seems to be counterintuitive and to permit superluminal velocities, and much ado has been reported about this aspect of nonlocality complete with *Alice in Wonderland* cartoons.[25] In the last paragraph of this section, we shall discuss this aspect of nonlocality further.

The period of libration for the trajectory for the corresponding microstate is given as[18]

$$t_{\text{libration}} = 4\frac{(ab - c^2/4)^{1/2}[1 + (\kappa/k)^2][a + b(\kappa/k)^2]}{a^2 + (2ab - c^2)(\kappa/k)^2 + b^2(\kappa/k)^4}\frac{m(q + \kappa^{-1})}{\hbar k}. \tag{18}$$

The fractional time of the libration period that the particle spends in the classically forbidden region is given by[3]

$$\frac{t_{+R} + t_{-R}}{t_{\text{libration}}} = \frac{1}{\kappa q + 1} = \frac{\hbar}{\hbar + [2m(U - E)]^{1/2} q}. \tag{19}$$

The fractional time is independent of the coefficients (a, b, c). Also as E approaches U from below, the fractional time approaches one. For Planck correspondence ($\hbar \to 0$), a previous investigation showed that the particle does not spend any time in the classically forbidden region.[3] This is also confirmed by Eq. (19) as its right side goes to zero as $\hbar \to 0$. While Bohr correspondence in the trajectory representation in the classically allowed region is analogous to Planck correspondence, they differ in the classically forbidden region.

Let us return to the allegedly anomaly of the counterintuitive nature that dwell times for reflection, t_R, decrease with increasing value of $(U - E)^{1/2}$. When examined from a dwell time aspect, this anomaly that manifests nonlocality is reasonable. But when fractional time in the classically forbidden region, Eq. (19), is considered, this nonlocal system is no longer counterintuitive. The particle, as manifested by Eq. (19), spends a greater proportion of its time in the classically forbidden region as E appproaches U from below.

4 WKB TURNING POINT

Let us now investigate the trajectory in the high energy limit in the vicinity of the WKB turning point. Here, too, we require that the value $V(x)$ be in the neighborhood of E even though we let E get large without limit. We also examine the transition between the classically allowed and classically forbidden regions in the high energy limit as the trajectory transits the WKB turning point. We choose the potential to be

$$V = fx, \tag{20}$$

which represents a constant force $f > 0$ acting on our particle. Any well-behaved one-dimensional potential for which the force remains finite and continuous can always be approximated by a linear potential in a sufficiently small region containing the WKB turning point as an interior point. As we shall show, while the value of f must be matched to the force exerted on the particle by the potential at the WKB turning point, it is not necessarily a global value for this investigation.

Let us digress briefly. In the previous two sections, we examined potentials that were at least piecewise constant. Even though the independent solution set, (ϕ, θ), for a step potential is mathematical simpler, such a potential does not have a classical short-wave correspondence at the WKB turning point for the relative change in the potential over a wavelength remains large there.[2]

For a particle with energy E, the WKB turning point, x_t, is given by $x_t = E/f$. An acceptable set of independent solutions, (ϕ, θ), to the Schrödinger equation is formed of Airy functions given by

$$\phi = \frac{(2m)^{1/12}\pi^{1/2}\mathrm{Ai}[(2mf/\hbar^2)^{1/3}(x - E/f)]}{(\hbar f)^{1/6}(ab - c^2/4)^{1/2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \theta = \frac{(2m)^{1/12}\pi^{1/2}\mathrm{Bi}[(2mf/\hbar^2)^{1/3}(x - E/f)]}{(\hbar f)^{1/6}(ab - c^2/4)^{1/2}}. \tag{21}$$

The reduced action for the linear potential specified by Eq. (20) is given by

$$W = \hbar \arctan\left(\frac{b\mathrm{Bi}(\xi/\hbar^{2/3})/\mathrm{Ai}(\xi/\hbar^{2/3}) + c/2}{(ab - c^2)^{1/2}}\right) \tag{22}$$

where $\xi = (2mf)^{1/3}(x - e/f)$.

We examine the quantum equation of motion that is given by Jacobi's theorem. For the particle with energy E and subject to the linear potential, Eq. (20), the motion is given by

$$t - t_o = \frac{\hbar^{1/3}}{\pi} \frac{(ab - c^2/4)^{1/2}(2m/f^2)^{1/3}}{a\mathrm{Ai}^2(\xi/\hbar^{2/3}) + b\mathrm{Bi}^2(\xi/\hbar^{2/3}) + c\mathrm{Ai}(\xi/\hbar^{2/3})\mathrm{Bi}(\xi/\hbar^{2/3})}. \tag{23}$$

As E increases in going to the high energy limit, the WKB turning point moves out continuously where, for nonlinear potentials, the instantaneous value of f must be adjusted continuously to manifest the gradient of the potential in the current vicinity of the turning point. Taking the high energy limit does not change the character of the physics of the situation. About $x_t = E/f$ or $\xi = 0$, there will be a finite neighborhood, part in the classically allowed region and part in the classically forbidden region, in which $(E - fx)$ or ξ will be small. In this finite neighborhood, the fractional change in value of $(E - V)$ will be large over a wavelength which will induce quantum effects.

For $a = b$ and $c = 0$, the motion of the particle displaced form the turning point is easily analyzed. For classically allowed x sufficiently displaced from the turning point at E/f with $a = b$ and $c = 0$, the Airy functions may be represented by asymptotic approximations that will manifest in the classically allowed region the classical motion given by[3]

$$t - t_o\Big|_{a=b;c=0} = \frac{[2m(E - fx)]^{1/2}}{f}, \quad E - fx \gg 1. \tag{24}$$

Likewise, for x displaced from x_t into the classically forbidden region, the velocity has been shown elsewhere to grow without bound as the particle penetrates further into the classically forbidden region.[3]

While the Planck correspondence, $\hbar \to 0$, showed that the measure of the transitional neighborhood across a WKB turning point reduces to zero,[3] the corresponding transitional neighborhood in the high energy limit remains finite. Nevertheless, for bound states in the high energy limit, the width the classically allowed region for many potentials may grow without bound. In such case, the relative measure of the transitional domain to the classically allowed domain may become infinitesimally small. In this sense, Bohr correspondence and Planck correspondence are partially similar.

5 INITIAL VALUES

Basically, our investigation of the Bohr correspondence supports our findings for Planck correspondence regarding initial conditions. The QSHJE is a third order nonlinear differential equation while the CSHJE is first order. The reduced action, W or $W^{\text{classical}}$, does not explicitly appear in either the quantum or classical equation respectively. Then, a set of necessary and sufficient initial values at x_o needed to specify the quantum conjugate momentum in addition to the constant of motion E is $[W_x(x_o), W_{xx}(x_o)]$ while just E is necessary and sufficient to specify the classical conjugate momentum. Subsequently, the quantum and classical reduced actions are known to within an arbitrary integration constant. The additional initial condition $W(x_o)$ specifies the integration constant K in Eq. (2).

The initial values for the solution of the QSHJE specify the particular microstate.[12,17] We note that when $a = b$ and $c = 0$, the quantum trajectory solutions in the high energy limit for $V = 0$ and for $V = fx$, with x sufficiently inside the classically allowed region, reduced to the classical trajectory solutions as shown by Eqs. (12) and (24) respectively. The underlying physics for $V = 0$ is that, for coefficients $a = b$ and $c = 0$, W_x by Eq. (7) becomes a constant, $(2mE)^{1/2}$, consistent with the corresponding $W_x^{\text{classical}}$. Even for finite energy, selecting $a = b$ and $c = 0$ causes W_{xx} and W_{xxx} to be zero consistent with classical mechanics for $V = 0$. If E is unknown, then $[W_x(x_o), W_{xx}(x_o), W_{xxx}(x_o)]$ forms a necessary and sufficient set of initial values to specify $W(x)$.[26] For the linear potential $V = fx$, selecting $a = b$ and $c = 0$, we have by Eq. (24) classical motion in the classically allowed region well displaced from the turning point. Thus, choosing $a = b$ and $c = 0$ tacitly induces the necessary initial values $[W_x(x_o), W_{xx}(x_o)]$ for the QSHJE to correspond to the superfluous initial values $[W_x^{\text{classical}}(x_o), W_{xx}^{\text{classical}}(x_o)]$ for the corresponding CSHJE. Another view is that classical mechanics inherently assumes that $a = b$ and $c = 0$ for our choices, Eqs. (4) and (21), for the set (ϕ, θ) of independent solutions. For completeness, had we chosen a different set of independent solutions than those specified by Eqs. (4) or (21) for $V = 0$ and $V = fx$ respectively, then, for that potential, we would have had to choose a different set of coefficients (a, b, c) to achieve Bohr correspondence to classical mechanics.

6 LOSS OF INFORMATION

Here too, our investigation of the Bohr correspondence supports our prior findings regarding Planck correspondence.[3] Passing to the high energy limit incurs a loss of information, associated with a set of necessary and sufficient initial values, due to going from the third-order QSHJE to the first-order CSHJE. Likewise, even for finite energy, the Copenhagen interpretation looses the information inherent to microstates of the trajectory representation despite the Copenhagen school asserting that the Schrödinger wave function is exhaustive. For completeness, we study loss of information for both cases and compare our results with 't Hooft.[16] There are similarities and significant differences.

First, we shall examine the quantum level (E finite). As already noted, the trajectory representation in its Hamilton-Jacobi formulation manifests microstates not discernible by the Schrödinger representation showing that the Schrödinger wave function cannot be the exhaustive description of nature.[9,17,19] For a specified energy E, each microstate, by itself, specifies the Schrödinger wave function. Yet, each microstate of energy eigenvalue E has a distinct trajectory specified by the set of initial values $[W_x(x_o), W_{xx}(x_o)]$. Are these microstates primordial at the Planck level? Yes, we have already shown elsewhere[26] that the

trajectories are deterministic and that the trajectory representation has arbitrary initial conditions at the Planck level. As the Copenhagen school asserts that ψ should be the exhaustive description of natural phenomenon, the Copenhagen school denies that primordial microstates could exist. Viewed externally, the Copenhagen school unwittingly makes ψ to be a de facto equivalence class of any putative microstates. This is consistent with the QSHJE being more fundamental than the stationary Schrödinger equation, in contrast to Messiah's assertation,[11] because, as shown elsewhere,[17] the bound-state boundary conditions of the QSHJE do not generate a unique solution but rather generate an infinite number of "primordial" microstates while the boundary conditions for the Schrödinger equation do generate a unique "equivalence-class" bound-state wave function. Let us make a few comparisons with a 't Hooft process. The primordial microstates are deterministic trajectories of discrete energy E in contrast to the 't Hooft primordial states that are of the continuum. Nevertheless, as all initial values are allowed for the microstates,[26] the trajectories for any equivalence class manifested by ψ densely spans finite phase space. Also, the Copenhagen school looses information on primordial microstates by default and not through a 't Hooft dissipative process.

Second, let us examine loss of information in the trajectory representation by executing the high energy limit. In the trajectory representation, residual indeterminacy manifests loss of information. The residual indeterminacy for the solution, W_x, of the QSHJE in the high energy limit is given for $V = 0$ by the trigonometric terms

$$[(a-b)^2 + c^2]^{1/2} \cos\{[2(2mE)^{1/2}x/\hbar] + \cot^{-1}[c/(a-b)]\}$$

in the denominator of Eq. (7). Here, we set the square of the amplitude of these trigonometric terms to be $A = (a-b)^2 + c^2$ where A is dimensionless. The phase shift of the argument of these trigonometric terms is manifested by $\cot^{-1}[c/(a-b)]$. The factor E in the argument of these trigonometric terms induces an indeterminacy in the high energy limit that makes the phase shift due to $\cot^{-1}[c/(a-b)]$ irrelevant. This represents a loss of information. On the other hand, the phase shift, $\cot^{-1}[c/(a-b)]$, is not redundant for specifying the set coefficients (a, b, c) from the set of necessary and sufficient initial values $[W_x(x_o), W_{xx}(x_o)]$ for the QSHJE for a finite E. Hence, the irrelevance of the phase shift gives the set of coefficients (a, b, c) another degree of freedom that makes the set of coefficients underspecified in the high energy limit. This underspecification of coefficients (a, b, c) permits the primordial microstates to form into equivalence classes where the primordial microstates establish the membership within any particular equivalence class and become identical with one another in the high energy limit. This information loss differs with that of 't Hooft. As before, the primordial microstates have discrete rather than continuum energies. Also again, no dissipation of information occurs in the trajectory representation when going to the high energy limit, but rather this loss of information induces an indeterminacy.

We may generalize to say that as classical mechanics has a smaller set of necessary and sufficient initial values than the trajectory representation of quantum mechanics, then there is some loss of information and the formation of equivalence classes as we go to the high energy limit. Also, the Copenhagen school by precept considers ψ to be exhaustive and disregards any microstate information. In either case, this loss of information is not due to any dissipation as it is in 't Hooft's proposal. Without dissipation, this loss of information may occur for the quantum stationary Hamilton-Jacobi process in the high energy limit.

7 INDETERMINACY

Let us begin by contrasting the residual indeterminacy of the trajectory representation to Heisenberg uncertainty. Our findings regarding the relationship between residual indeterminacy and the Heisenburg uncertainty principle in the high energy limit are consistent with our analogous findings for $\hbar \to 0$.[3] Residual indeterminacy exists when energy increases without bound ($E \to \infty$). For finite E, there is no indeterminacy as the trajectory and E are specified by the sufficient set initial conditions $(\dddot{x}_o, \ddot{x}_o, \dot{x}_o, x_o)$ or $[W_{xxx}(x_o), W_{xx}(x_o), W_x(x_o), x_o]$.[26] On the other hand, Heisenberg uncertainty exists for finite E. We note that residual indeterminacy is consistent with the findings of Faraggi and Matone that the equivalence princi-

ple exists for quantum mechanics but not for classical mechanics.[10] Otherwise, the trajectory representation remains causal[27] and deterministic.

Heisenberg uncertainty exists in the $[x, p]$ domain (where p is momentum) since the Hamiltonian operates in the $[x, p]$ domain. On the other hand, the trajectory representation through a canonical transformation to its Hamilton-Jacobi formulation operates in the $[x, t]$ domain.[28] Residual indeterminacy of the trajectory representation is in the $[x, t]$ domain, cf. Eqs. (14) and (24).

The Copenhagen representation, based upon Heisenberg uncertainty tacitly, uses an insufficient set of initial values to specify quantum motion. The subset of initial values that the Copenhagen representation is sufficient to specify ψ but precludes knowledge of its microstates. The Heisenberg uncertainty principle masks the fundamental cause of uncertainty in the Copenhagen interpretation. As long as the Copenhagen interpretation uses an insufficient set of initial values to solve the QSHJE, it cannot achieve certainty. Carroll has speculated that the Copenhagen substitute for exact microstate knowledge is, in itself, an uncertainty principle.[15] Carroll goes on to note that standard quantum mechanics can still be used with the acknowledgement that microstate knowledge has been sacrificed (i.e., quantum mechanics in Hilbert space is imprecise by construction so a probabilistic theory follows).[15]

In closing, we remark on the impact of residual indeterminacy. Our findings for the trajectory representation in the high energy limit are consistent with Liboff's findings[1] for the Schrödinger representation. In the high energy limit, $E \to \infty$, the trajectory representation of quantum mechanics does not generally go to classical mechanics in contradiction to Bohr's correspondence principle. Nor does it go to statistical mechanics as the amplitude of the indeterminacy is given by $[(a-b)^2 + c^2]^{1/2}$ for the sets of independent solutions of the Schrödinger equation used herein, cf. Eqs (4) and (21).

Acknowledgement

I heartily thank M. Matone, A. E. Faraggi, and R. Carroll for their stimulating discussions and encouragement. I also thank G. 't Hooft for discussing his ideas on information loss and equivalence classes.

References

1. R. L. Liboff, Phys. Today **47**(2) 55 (1984); Ann. Fond. L. deBroglie **5**, 215 (1980); Int. J. Theor. Phys. **18**, 185 (1979); Fond. Phys. **5**, 271 (1975).
2. J. Ford and G. Mantica, Am. J. Phys. **60**, 1086 (1992).
3. E. R. Floyd, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A 15**, 1363 (2000).
4. N. Bohr in *Sources of Quantum Mechanics* edited by B. L. Van der Waerden (Dover, New York, 1967) pp. 95-137.
5. L. Rosenfeld, ed. *Niels Bohr, Collected Works* Vol. 3 (North Holland, New York, 1976)
6. E. R. Floyd, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **27**, 273 (1988).
7. G. Bertoldi, A. E. Faraggi and M. Matone, Class. Quant. Grav. **17**, 3965 (2000), hep-th/9909201.
8. A. E. Faraggi and M. Matone, Phys. Lett. **B 437**, 369 (1998), hep-th/9711028; Phys. Lett. **B 445**, 357 (1998), hep-th/9809126; Phys. Lett. **B 450**, 34 (1999), hep-th/9705108.
9. A. E. Faraggi and M. Matone, Phys. Lett. **A 249**, 180 (1998), hep-th/9801033.
10. A. E. Faraggi and M. Matone, Phys. Lett. **B 445**, 77 (1998) hep-th/9809125; Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A 15**, 1869 (2000), hep-th/9809127.
11. A. Messiah, *Quantum Mechanics* Vol. 1 (North Holland, New York, 1961) p. 232.
12. E. R. Floyd, Phys. Rev. **D 34**, 3246 (1986).
13. E. R. Floyd, An. Fond. Louis de Broglie **20**, 263 (1995).
14. R. Carroll, Can. J. Phys. **77** 319 (1999), quant-ph/9904081
15. R. Carroll, *Quantum Theory, Deformation and Integrability* (Elsevier, 2000, Amsterdam) pp. 50-56.
16. G. 't Hooft, Class. Quantum Grav. **16**, 3263 (1999), gr-qc/9903084
17. E. R. Floyd, Found. Phys. Lett. **9**, 489 (1996) quant-ph/9707051.
18. E. R. Floyd, Found. Phys. Lett. **13**, 235 (2000).
19. E. R. Floyd, Phys. Rev. **D 26**, 1339 (1982).

20. T. E. Hartman, J. App. Phys. **33**. 3247 (1962).
21. J. R. Fletcher, J. Phys. **C 18**, L55 (1985).
22. E. H. Hauge and J. A. Stoveng, Rev. Mod. Phys. **61**, 917 (1989).
23. V. S. Olkhovsky and E. Racami, Phys. Rep. **214**, 339 (1992).
24. G. Barton, Ann. Phys. (NY) **166**, 322 (1986).
25. R. Y. Chiao, P. G. Kwiat, and A. M. Steinberg, Sci. Am., **269**(2), 52 (Aug. 1993)
26. E. R. Floyd, Phys. Rev. **D 29**, 1842 (1984).
27. E. R. Floyd, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A 14**, 1111 (1999), quant-ph/9708026; **16**, 2447 (2001).
28. D. Park, *Classical Dynamics and Its Quantum Analogues*, 2nd ed. (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1990) p. 142.